

LONG RANGE PLANNING

**TO:** Plan Review Steering Committee  
**FROM:** Long Range Planning Staff  
**DATE:** September 19, 2000  
**SUBJECT:** Summary Notes from the GMA Steering Committee meeting of  
September 14, 2000

**Attendance:**

Steering Committee Members:

Darrell Alder	City of Washougal Council Member (P)
Dean Dossett	City of Camas Mayor (P)
William Ganley	City of Battle Ground Mayor
Jeanne Harris	City of Vancouver Council Member (A)
John Idsinga	City of Battle Ground Council Member (P)
Mary Kufeldt-Antle	City of Camas Council Member (A)
Betty Sue Morris	Clark County Board of Commissioners
Craig Pridemore	Clark County Board of Commissioners (Chair)
Michael Hefflin	City of Ridgefield Council Member
	<b>(P) Primary (A) Alternate</b>

Public:

Marnie Allen	Clark County Schools
Foster Church	The Oregonian
Kathy Folkers	Howsley Law Office
Ken Hadley	Self
Jessica Hoffman	Clark County Association of Realtors
Elizabeth Holmes	Landerholm Law Firm
Patrick Holmes	Howsley Law Office
Corrinne Humphrey	The JD White Company
Neil Olson	CCHBA
Keith Pfeifer	Self
Sandy Reimer	Brush Prairie Neighborhood
George Vartanian	Self
Bud Van Cleve	NE Hazel Dell Neighborhood Association
David Ward	Landerholm Law Firm

Staff:

Monty Anderson	City of Washougal Planning Director
Bill Barron	Clark County Administrator
Dan Bauer	Clark County Assessment and GIS
Rich Carson	Clark County Community Development Director
Derek Chisholm	City of Vancouver Long Range Planning
Mike Conway	City of Washougal Public Works Director
Tamara DeRidder	City of Vancouver Long Range Planning Manager
Eric Eisemann	Cities of La Center & Ridgefield
Lianne Forney	Clark County Public Outreach & Information Director
Bob Higbie	Clark County Long Range Planning
Eric Holmes	City of Battle Ground Planning Director
Mary Keltz	Clark County Board of Commissioner's Office
Jeanne Lawson	Jeanne Lawson Associates
Patrick Lee	Clark County Long Range Planning Manager
Rich Lowry	Clark County Chief Civil Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
Dale Miller	Clark County Long Range Planning
Oliver Orjiako	Clark County Long Range Planning
Marty Snell	City of Camas Planning Manager
Brian Snodgrass	City of Vancouver Planner
Deb Wallace	C-Tran
Josh Warner	Clark County Community Development
Phil Wuest	Clark County Long Range Planning

**Introductions / Roll Call**

Called to order at 4:00 PM by Commissioner Craig Pridemore. Attendees introduced themselves and their affiliations.

**Approve August 24 Steering Committee Notes**

No corrections. Notes accepted as published.

**Summary of August Small Group Meetings – Jeanne Lawson Associates**

Jeanne Lawson hands out the Agenda for the Saturday citizen's assembly and the comments from the public small group meetings. Twelve meetings were held. The committee members attended many of the meetings and this helped to validate the meetings. The meetings were small groups comprised of interested citizens. Some key issues raised were:

- Comments about responsiveness in recent years from the county and consulting with citizens, though this was not universal;
- Concern that defining rural is not on the table and should be;

- Concern about quality of life issues – parks, schools and how planning is connected;
- Need to maintain balance and flexibility - try not to get caught-up in the minutia of the process;
- People want responsiveness and to know what the limitations are of planning; and
- A desire for education on the process.

Jeanne explains the organization of the handout with has responses from the meeting. The items are grouped by issue category that will be addressed and then by other issues. Meetings in an area were not exclusively for the people in the area, but that was primarily the case.

Following the Saturday citizen's assembly there will be topic groups convened. The previous information will be used to inform those meetings. There are six topics for break-out groups at the assembly. The topic groups will try to come up with some conclusions to inform the November 8 meeting. There will not be specific recommendations to the steering committee from this process, but only the general ideas that were expressed.

### **Population Forecast Selection Options - Implications of different population forecast ranges on:**

Pat Lee introduces Dan Bauer of Clark County Assessment and GIS to do a presentation on the assumptions behind the buildable lands model.

- **Buildable Lands Assumptions**

Dan Bauer and Oliver Orjiako present. Oliver Orjiako says that this is to inform the committee about the modeling that took place and the changes from 1994. This is intended to be a brief overview.

Project history – the modeling process began in 1992 to look at vacant lands. GIS was chosen as the model. The model is looked at on an annual basis. Changes have been made in 2000 from recommendation by the TAC. Data is gathered from GIS mapping layers and the Assessor's database. Critical lands were reviewed and updated. They are currently divided into two types. The model is reliant on the Assessor's database, which is generally updated on an annual basis.

There are three separate models: industrial, commercial and residential. Commercial valuation for vacant lands has changed from the last model. The determination is made as to vacant or built. There are also underutilized parcels within the built parcels. Critical lands is a very important issue in the model.

Jeanne Harris asks a question about the vacancy label for underutilized land. Oliver Orjiako responds that if the value is low the probability it will be redeveloped is great.

Betty Sue Morris asks what percent needs to be critical lands before it is removed.

Oliver Orjiako responds that there are two types of critical lands. If it is 50 percent of either type or both combined it is removed from the buildable lands inventory. This is a change from 1994.

Mary Kufeldt-Antle asks why the \$67,500 number is used. Oliver Orjiako says that that number is seen as being a low valued structure on that particular land. There is no size requirement. Mary Kufeldt-Antle questions this reasoning. She says the land is not as readily available as truly vacant land. Craig Pridemore says that this is the number that the TAC came up with and the numbers can be disputed. Mary Kufeldt-Antle asks if this makes a large different in the Plan Monitoring Report as to what land is truly vacant. Oliver Orjiako responds that it will continue to be looked at in the future. Dean Gossett is still uncomfortable with the assumption. Oliver Orjiako says the low valued properties could be picked out and presented to the committee individually.

The residential model is shown next. TAC looked at the evaluation number for vacant lands and moved the value to \$13,000. The “underutilized” criteria also changed. The mansions and condo category was changed as well by the change in the valuation.

Mary Kufeldt-Antle questions whether the valuation on an acreage is valid. Oliver Orjiako responds that the valuation is only for properties in the UGB and that subdivision is possible. It does not apply to the rural area. There are not many of these in the urban area. Betty Sue Morris asks about buildable land and the population. In the underutilized acreage is there an assumption that they will subdivide in the 20-year planning horizon. Oliver Orjiako responds that there are many assumptions that try to balance all of the concerns, but no modeling is perfect.

Betty Sue Morris wants to know the percentage of vacant and underutilized. Oliver Orjiako says he will get the information. Jeanne Harris asks if the assumptions used in the model are similar to those used in other areas of the county. Oliver Orjiako responds that the answer is yes and this was reviewed intensively in 1994 when the model was originally being implemented.

Dan Bauer moves to the industrial model. The keys are size, building value which was changed by TAC, and ranked by critical land and infrastructure service. Vacant parcels are classified as primary, secondary or tertiary. Mary Kufeldt-Antle asks why we count tertiary. Oliver Orjiako says it is looked at parcel by parcel and is from the Industrial Lands Committee. He adds that it is trying to look at the lands by quality. Dean Gossett is concerned that this will skew the buildable lands numbers because the acreage includes critical lands that cannot be developed. Pat Lee says that some critical lands have been built on in the recent past. Oliver Orjiako says that the land can be utilized, but in different intensities. The tertiary lands are available but have limitations. Betty Sue Morris comments that the rankings need to be looked at. She asks if building on wetlands is better than moving the UGB and states that this is a values question. Dean Dossett comments that critical lands that are wetlands scare people because it is expensive to develop. The conversation shifts to a question about

stormwater facilities in wetlands and buffers. Rich Lowry says that stormwater facilities cannot be located in class 2 buffers. Mary Kufeldt-Antle says that we require developers to be sensitive and that we are being hypocritical because if it is sensitive then we should avoid the lands and not consider it in the buildable land inventory. Craig Pridemore suggests that the methodologies of the modeling are very complex and not subject to simple solutions. Rich Lowry says that the Hearings Board did question the validity of the tertiary classification. Industrial lands made the most sense to zone them. The prime is the key figure that we are planning for. Dean Dossett asks if all of the industrial land is tertiary will the UGB be moved. Oliver Orjiako responds that the issue would then be looked at very critically. The land may be carried in the inventory and may be able to adjust in more land.

Eric Holmes says the categorization of industrial lands may be of concern for Battle Ground. The Comp Plan only focuses on the prime land, which is good according to Eric Holmes. Oliver Orjiako responds that absorption looks back to if we are meeting the goals of the Plan. The 60/40 number is on actual permit numbers.

William Ganley asks if the numbers are available. Craig Pridemore says all of the numbers are in the Plan Monitoring Report. He states that there will be errors in the mapping, but there is still a need for assumptions. Oliver Orjiako says we are very sensitive to industrial lands because there is a classification given to the land. The lands can be delineated by specific property if necessary.

Dan Bauer says there are many maps available. In December 2000 the new model will be run.

Craig Pridemore reiterates that there are many details in the models and they are very complex.

### **Land consumption and policies such as:**

#### **Urban Growth Boundaries and Urban Reserves lands**

Pat Lee presents the handout and the implications of the different assumptions. Look at the population forecasts and employment growth. Also the available lands inventory. "UR" total is urban reserves in the top right table. Betty Sue Morris asks about the model and urban reserves. Pat Lee responds that the assumptions are on the last page. There are different scenarios presented, not recommendations. The scenarios give a sense of the implications. Scenario #2 is what has been observed. Scenarios 3-5 are predications for the future. Scenario #1 was the 1994 assumptions. Pat Lee walks through the scenarios. A negative number means there is a deficit in the current UGB if that projection is chosen. Craig Pridemore says looking at #4 using the medium population projection there would be an 1,161 acre deficit to meet the population expansion. This is only one of the thresholds, it is also necessary to look at the other criteria in the Plan. The UGB can be moved if that is chosen. Betty Sue Morris looks at scenario #4. Craig says the numbers are for the 20-year out timeline. Pat Lee says the tables are obviously bound by the assumptions.

Rich Lowry reviews the options associated with the 75/50 goal. There are four options. Section 130 of the Growth Management Act speaks to not having to look at boundary changes in this 5-year review. The options: redraw boundaries now, but this will go against 75/50; treat this update as a pre-planning exercise and wait until we hit the 75/50 numbers; vary the 75/50 rule a bit by bringing in some land, but not giving it urban zoning, leaving it as UH; or, keep the status quo, but this would not acknowledge the needs for capital facilities and would waste some of the work that has been done so far in the process.

Betty Sue Morris asks if there are other counties with the specific numerical standard. Rich Lowry responds that there are no other counties that he knows of with specific standards to meet. Betty Sue Morris says the 75 percent rule might not be able to be enforced by the courts. She does not see the rule as a brick wall. Rich Lowry says there are legal constraints because the county did not appeal the 75 percent rule. We can get rid of the 5-year rule. Betty Sue Morris asks, if the 75 percent rule is thrown out then we would have another shot at challenge. Rich Lowry says that this legally difficult. There is some support for challenging the 75 percent rule. Mary Kufeldt-Antle says that we are too bureaucratic, and we are not doing what the people want. Rich Lowry says that the housing mix and density goals cannot be missed. These are also critical issues under 6094. Pat Lee says that we are only achieving 20 percent in multifamily housing. Rich Lowry says there is a question of where solutions can come from in changing the goals.

Craig Pridemore goes back to scenario #4 and says that in 2020 we would need to add the 1,161 acres in that year with the medium population projection. The need to add land into the UGB is not today. Dean Gossett wants to see prime industrial land in the table, and not all of the industrial lands combined. Brian Snodgrass presents some info on population and growth trends in a handout. The tables confirm fast growth, though there is a recent slowdown. We have surpassed the OFM numbers, but not by too much and the future numbers might be close to the projections. In other areas of the state the OFM numbers were more accurate. He made a crude estimate in Table #4. The market factor assumption is a big impact assumption. There is an estimate of when we would run out of land. Whatever forecast is chosen it can be changed in 5-years time.

## **Capital Facilities Plans**

Pat Lee says that more is to come on this soon.

## **81/19 urban/rural residential split**

Craig Pridemore says that the population in rural areas is currently about 19 percent. Pat Lee presents the new tables that show what 100 percent of growth in the UGA would look like. Phil Wuest says that the numbers are bad and need to be corrected in the next couple weeks.

## **Other**

Two more meetings will be held and then the committee will go back to one meeting a month. Bob Higbie says the dates for future meetings are Oct 18<sup>th</sup> and Oct 26<sup>th</sup>.

## **Adjourned**

The Steering Committee adjourned at 6:00 PM.

h:\long range planning\projects\cpt 99.003 five year update\cpt 99-003 - steering committee\minutes - steering\steering committee - september 14 2000.doc